

bears nearly three-fourths of these costs, primarily through medical expenses, increased insurance premiums, taxes, and lost worker productivity.

Yet these costs pale in comparison to the agony endured by parents, families, and friends of a teen driver whose life ends tragically and prematurely.

Brett Karlin's family, despite their immense pain and grief, made the generous decision to donate Brett's organs, providing the opportunity for others to live. That opportunity to give the gift of life often comes in the wake of sudden tragedy. When families embrace that opportunity, organ donation often provides renewed hope for the donor's family as well as for the recipients whose lives are saved by the donation.

A new person is added to the national organ donation waiting list in America every 13 minutes, and sadly, 17 people each day die waiting for transplants that cannot take place because of the shortage of donated organs. Illinois is fortunate to have the country's largest donor registry with more than 6 million participants. Although tremendous strides in promoting organ donation have been made, more than 320 Illinois residents died in 2004 while waiting for an organ transplant.

I commend Brakes for Brett for its valuable educational efforts. Today we remember Brett Karlin's life and honor him by recommitting ourselves to teen driver safety education and organ donation. Through these and similar efforts, we can make great strides to preserve young lives that might otherwise be lost.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2005 budget through July 26, 2005. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2006 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, H. Con. Res. 95.

The estimates show that current level spending is under the budget resolution by \$4.986 billion in budget authority and by \$27 million in outlays in 2005. Current level for revenues is \$407 million above the budget resolution in 2005.

Since my last report dated June 30, 2005, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the TANF Extension Act of 2005, P.L. 109-19, the Surface Transportation Act of 2005, Part II, P.L. 109-20, the Surface Transportation Act of 2005, Part III, P.L. 109-35,

and the Surface Transportation Act of 2005, Part IV, P.L. 109-37 which changed budget authority and outlays.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2005.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed tables show the effects of Congressional action on the 2005 budget and are current through July 26, 2005. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions for fiscal year 2005 that underlie H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006.

Since my last letter, dated June 29, 2005, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues:

TANF Extension Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-19); Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II (Public Law 109-20); Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III (Public Law 109-35); and Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part IV (Public Law 109-37).

In addition, a correction was made to the final scoring of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-14). The estimate of budget authority was reduced by \$28 million for fiscal year 2005.

Sincerely,
ELIZABETH M. ROBINSON,
(For Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director).

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF JULY 26, 2005

(In billions of dollars)

| | Budget resolution ¹ | Current level ² | Current level over/under (–) resolution |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| ON-BUDGET | | | |
| Budget Authority | 1,996.6 | 1,991.6 | –5.0 |
| Outlays | 2,023.9 | 2,023.9 | * |
| Revenues | 1,483.7 | 1,484.1 | 0.4 |
| OFF-BUDGET | | | |
| Social Security Outlays | 398.1 | 398.1 | 0 |
| Social Security Revenues | 573.5 | 573.5 | 0 |

¹ H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed the enactment of emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005, in the amount of \$81.811 million in budget authority and \$32.121 million in outlays, which would be exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level excludes the emergency appropriations in P.L. 109-13 (see footnote 2 of Table 2), the amounts specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced for purposes of comparison.

² Current level is the estimated effect on revenue and spending of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made.

Note: * = less than \$50 million.
Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF JULY 26, 2005

(In millions of dollars)

| | Budget authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Enacted in Previous Sessions:¹ | | | |
| Revenues | n.a. | n.a. | 1,484,024 |
| Permanents and other spending legislation | 1,109,476 | 1,070,500 | n.a. |

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005, AS OF JULY 26, 2005—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

| | Budget authority | Outlays | Revenues |
|--|------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Appropriation legislation | 1,298,963 | 1,369,221 | n.a. |
| Offsetting receipts | –415,912 | –415,912 | n.a. |
| Total, enacted in previous sessions: | 1,992,527 | 2,023,809 | 1,484,024 |
| Enacted This Session: | | | |
| Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13) ² | –1,058 | 4 | 41 |
| Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-14) | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| TANF Extension Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-19) | 81 | 45 | 0 |
| Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II (P.L. 109-20) .. | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part III (P.L. 109-35) .. | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part IV (P.L. 109-37) .. | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Total, enacted this session: ... | –938 | 49 | 41 |
| Total Current Level ^{2,3} | 1,991,589 | 2,023,858 | 1,484,065 |
| Total Budget Resolution Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements ⁴ | –81,881 | –32,121 | n.a. |
| Adjusted Budget Resolution | 1,996,575 | 2,023,885 | 1,483,658 |
| Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution | n.a. | n.a. | 407 |
| Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution | 4,986 | 27 | n.a. |

¹ The effects of an act to provide for the proper tax treatment of certain disaster mitigation payments (P.L. 109-7) and the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-8) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

² Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level excludes \$83.140 million in budget authority and \$33.034 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 (P.L. 109-13).

³ Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

⁴ H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed the enactment of emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2005, in the amount of \$81.811 million in budget authority and \$32.121 million in outlays, which would be exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current level excludes the emergency appropriations in P.L. 109-13 (see footnote 2), the amounts specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced for purposes of comparison.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law; * = less than \$500,000.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

CHANGES TO 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND SPENDING LIMITS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the President's fiscal year 2006 budget request includes four cap adjustments to encourage adequate funding for program integrity efforts. In each of the four programs, continuing disability reviews, IRS tax enforcement, health care fraud and abuse control, and unemployment insurance, additional funding dedicated to program integrity can reduce improper payments and return money to the treasury. For example, the administration estimates that

each \$1 expended on continuing disability reviews returns \$10 to taxpayers.

Consistent with the President's request, section 404b of H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, permits the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to make adjustments to the 302a allocations to the Appropriations Committee and discretionary spending limits when certain conditions are met relating to appropriations levels for these four program integrity initiatives. I note that our distinguished ranking member, Senator CONRAD, is a real leader in the area of tax enforcement and worked to ensure that our congressional budget included \$446 million to address the tax gap.

These conditions having been met in the reported Labor, HHS, Education, and Transportation, Treasury, Judiciary, HUD appropriations bills, I ask consent to insert a table into the RECORD which reflects the revised discretionary spending limits and 302a allocations to the Senate Appropriations Committee. The revised allocations for discretionary budget authority and outlays are the appropriate levels to be used for enforcement during consideration of the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bills.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following chart printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADJUSTMENTS TO FY 2006 302(a) ALLOCATIONS TO THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS AND 2006
DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS
(\$ in millions)

| | Initial allocation/cap | Adjustment | New allocation/cap |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Discretionary BA | 842,265 | 755 | 843,020 |
| OT | 916,081 | 755 | 916,836 |

THE UNITED STATES AND NEPAL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the situation in Nepal, which has received too little attention by the Congress.

I will not take the time to discuss in detail the history of this tiny country wedged between China and India. Suffice it to say that not only is Nepal among the world's least developed countries, it is also facing a ruthless Maoist insurgency and a political crisis instigated by King Gyanendra which together threaten to turn Nepal into a failed state.

Last year, after receiving disturbing reports of widespread human rights violations by the Royal Nepalese Army, including arrests, disappearances, torture and extrajudicial killings of civilians, the Congress imposed a number of conditions on our military aid to Nepal. Those conditions required the Nepalese Government to (1) comply with habeas corpus orders issued by the Supreme Court of Nepal; (2) cooperate with the National Human

Rights Commission to identify and resolve all security related cases of individuals in government custody; (3) grant the National Human Rights Commission unimpeded access to all places of detention; and (4) take effective steps to end torture by security forces and prosecute members of such forces who are responsible for gross violations of human rights.

Unfortunately, not only have those conditions not been met, the situation was made significantly worse on February 1 when King Gyanendra, with the backing of the security forces, dissolved the multiparty government, arrested and jailed political opponents, human rights activists and journalists, and declared a state of emergency. The state of emergency has since been lifted, but civil liberties, including freedom of the press and association, remain restricted, the former Prime Minister has been jailed for corruption by an extrajudicial, politically motivated anticorruption commission, and arrests of journalists and democracy activists continue.

Speaking with one voice, the United States, Great Britain, and India condemned the King's actions as a setback for democracy. They said it would make it more difficult to resolve the Maoist problem, and each country imposed varying types of restrictions on military aid. Since then, however, the American Embassy has adopted a more nuanced approach, sending mixed messages that have been widely interpreted as giving equal consideration and validity to the views and actions of the King and the political parties. Unfortunately, the impression today of Nepalese pro-democracy and human rights activists is that the United States is not fully behind them.

The army insists it is complying with habeas corpus orders of the supreme court. This is deceiving, however, because the security forces, often in plain clothes, have been re-arresting people who the court has ordered released. In some instances they have waited at the courthouse steps to take people back into custody immediately after they are set free by the court. Since these arrests are often made without charges, the whereabouts and treatment of these people is often unknown.

In April, the term of the National Human Rights Commission expired and the Government reconstituted the Commission in a manner that was incompatible with the 1990 Nepalese Constitution. The membership of the Commission has also changed, with the exception of the chairman. Not surprisingly, none of the current members, appointed by the palace, expressed publicly any disagreement with the King's February 1 actions, including the arrests and curtailing of civil liberties. The chairman of the Commission even expressed support for the King's actions. This has caused legitimate concerns about the Commission's independence.

There is conflicting information about the Government's cooperation

with the National Human Rights Commission in resolving security related cases of persons in custody. According to human rights groups, the situation has not improved. The Commission has said it is getting better access to places of detention, but it is not clear how meaningful this access is. We know there are large numbers of people who have disappeared, yet we are informed that when members of the Commission visit army barracks they have seen few detainees, are led around by army escorts, and that some barracks where detainees were reported to be held were completely empty. There is a concern that the army is summarily executing prisoners. Meanwhile, the International Red Cross has suspended its visits to prisoners because of the army's failure to provide the access it requires.

The issue of ending torture and prosecuting members of the security forces who commit gross violations of human rights is also difficult to assess. According to human rights groups, torture is routinely practiced and impunity remains the norm. The army claims it disciplines its members who violate human rights, but many of the cases it cites do not involve human rights violations. According to the army officer who heads the army's human rights cell, complaints about human rights violations by the army are "much ado about nothing." Those words speak volumes.

Under our law, the Secretary of State is to determine whether the conditions have been met. As a sponsor of the law, I would expect that prior to making any determination she would consult with representatives of reputable human rights groups, including the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, as well as with the British and Indian Governments. It is important that we and they be seen as united on these issues. In that regard, I would hope that she would consider the implications of such a determination in the context of the larger political crisis. We do not want to do anything that could be seen as further evidence that the United States supports the King when he is using the army and police to crush the forces of democracy.

Last week, the Senate revisited the conditions on our military aid for Nepal. Since those conditions were enacted prior to February 1, they have in large measure been eclipsed by subsequent events. The Senate determined that modifications were needed, and those changes were adopted unanimously on July 20, 2005, in an amendment to the fiscal year 2006 State-Foreign Operations-appropriations bill.

Nepal is a breathtakingly beautiful country facing immense challenges. The majority of its people are illiterate, subsistence farmers who are caught between the Maoists, who extort money and food, forcibly recruit their children, and commit atrocities, and the army which mistreats and often shoots those suspected of sympathizing with the Maoists.